

REMARKS

The Office Action dated May 11, 2010, has been received and carefully noted. The above amendments and the following remarks are being submitted as a full and complete response thereto.

Claims 1-12 are rejected, and Claim 7 is objected to. Claims 1-12 are amended, and new Claims 13-16 are added. Thus, Claims 1-16 are pending in this application. Support for the amendments may be found at least on page 15, lines 1 to 16, and Figures 5 and 11-14 in the specification as originally filed. Applicants submit that no new matter is added. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections.

Objections

Claim 7 is objected to for informalities. Claim 7 has been amended in a manner believed to be responsive to the rejection. Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the objection.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. §102/§103

Claims 1-5 and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Stevenson (U.S. Patent No. 5,421,979, hereinafter “Stevenson”). Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Stevenson in view of Kinoshita et al. (U.S. Patent No. 3,977,806, hereinafter “Kinoshita”). Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Stevenson as applied to Claims 1-5 and 11 above, and in further view of Kakehi (U.S. Patent No. 4,718,681, hereinafter “Kakehi”).

Claims 8-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Stevenson as applied to Claims 1-5 and 11 above, and in further view of Yoshioka et al. (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0079057, hereinafter "Yoshioka"). Claim 12 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Stevenson as applied to Claims 1-5 and 11 above, and in further view of Tezuka (U.S. Patent No. 4,771,730, hereinafter "Tezuka").

Claim 1 recites a thin film forming apparatus comprising, among other features, a transferring device to transfer one of a substrate itself or a substrate fixing jig fixedly holding a substrate or a plurality of substrates that is removeably securable **onto the outer circumferential surface of the substrate holder** to/from the substrate holder in the evacuable chamber; and securing means for releasably securing the substrate itself or the substrate fixing jig transferred by the transferring to/from means **onto the outer circumferential surface of the substrate holder**. Applicants respectfully submit that Stevenson does not teach or suggest all of the features recited by Claim 1.

The Office Action asserts that Stevenson teaches a film forming apparatus comprising transferring means (120) to transfer a substrate fixing jig (66) fixedly holding a substrate (64) that is removeably secured onto the outer circumferential surface of a substrate holder (100) and securing means (126) to releasably secure the substrate fixing jig transferred by the transferring means onto the outer circumferential surface of the substrate holder. Applicants respectfully submit, however, that Stevenson does not teach or suggest that the substrate fixing jig is removeably securable onto **the outer circumferential surface of the substrate holder**. Rather, as best seen in Figures 2, 8, 10, 12, 15, and 16, the substrate fixing jig (66) is secured within a gap (transport

stations 102) formed within the substrate holder (100). Stevenson further discloses that the substrate transporter “includes a plurality of elongated transport-station 102 arranged peripherally therearound . . . [An] upper longitudinal member 110 includes generally rectangular slots 125. Each slot is aligned . . . for guiding a substrate carrier 66 **into the grooves.**” (Emphasis added). See column 6, line 60 to column 7, line 9. Indeed, Applicants note that the Office Action does not cite where Stevenson teaches the substrate fixing jib (66) being secured onto the outer circumferential surface of the substrate holder. Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that Stevenson does not teach or suggest a substrate fixing that is removeably securable onto the outer circumferential surface of a substrate holder, as recited by claim 1.

To qualify as prior art under 35 U.S.C. §102, each and every feature recited in a rejected claim must be disclosed by the applied art. For at least the reasons provided above, Applicants submit that Stevenson does not disclose or suggest each and every feature recited by pending Claims 1. Accordingly, Stevenson does not anticipate, nor render obvious, the subject matter recited by Claim 1. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit independent Claim 1 should be deemed allowable over Stevenson

Kinoshita is cited merely for teaching an electric signal to control a motor. Kakehi is cited merely for teaching a mechanism for holding a work piece in a vacuum chamber in which securing means holds the work piece in position by pressing with a retaining means, and for teaching a drive unit. Yoshioka is cited merely for teaching an apparatus in which a work piece is held and transferred in a vacuum using a magnetic force and using an evacuable transferring chamber to move a substrate from an evacuable load/lock chamber to an evacuable processing chamber. Tezuka is cited

merely for teaching sputtering, ion etching, and plasma CVD techniques for processing a substrate in a vacuum chamber. Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that Kinoshita, Kakehi, Yoshioka, and Tezuka do not cure the above-described deficiencies of Stevenson.

Claims 2-16 depend from Claim 1. It is respectfully submitted that these dependent claims be deemed allowable for the same reasons Claim 1 is allowable, as well as for the additional subject matter recited therein. Furthermore, Applicants respectfully submit that Stevenson, Kinoshita, Kakehi, Yoshioka, and Tezuka also do not teach or suggest, alone or combination, the features recited by new dependent claims 13-16.

For at least the above reasons, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of Claims 1-6 and 11 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) over Stevenson and Kinoshita and the rejection of Claims 1-5 and 7-12 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Stevenson, Kakehi, Yoshioka, and Tezuka.

Conclusion

Applicants respectfully submit that this application is in condition for allowance and such action is earnestly solicited. If the Examiner believes that anything further is desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicants' undersigned representative at the telephone number listed below to schedule a personal or telephone interview to discuss any remaining issues.

In the event that this paper is not being timely filed, the Applicants respectfully petition for an appropriate extension of time. Any fees for such an extension, together with any additional fees that may be due with respect to this paper, may be charged to Counsel's Deposit Account Number 01-2300, referencing Docket Number 029567-00009.

Respectfully submitted,



Seth Barney
Registration Number 61,187

Customer Number 004372
ARENT FOX LLP
1050 Connecticut Avenue, NW
Suite 400
Washington, DC 20036-5339
Telephone: 202-857-6000
Fax: 202-638-4810

SB:vmh